UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,305	07/16/2003	Mark Smith	03-344	4358

34704 7590 09/24/2007

BACHMAN & LAPOINTE, P.C.
900 CHAPEL STREET
SUITE 1201
NEW HAVEN, CT 06510

EXAMINER	
HAMILTON, MATTHEW L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/622,305	SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew L. Hamilton	3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the application filed on 16 July 2003.

2. Claims 1-37 are currently pending and have been examined.

3. **Examiner's Note**: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Inventorship

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Specification

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

6. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length

since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

7. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-11, 13, 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Day et al US Patent 5,857,175.

Claims 1 and 27:

As per claims 1 and 27, Day teaches a method and a system comprising the steps of:

- *compiling a database of electronic offers* (column 3, lines 25-28);
- *allowing access to said database by at least one point of sale system* (column 5, lines 10-11 and lines 13-15);
- *providing said at least one point of sale system with a redemption engine for validating at least one offer to be made to a consumer while a sales transaction is being processed by the at least one point of sale system* (column 5, lines 24-31);
- *identifying a consumer and a sales transaction event involving said consumer* (column 6, lines 13-19);

- *using said redemption engine to determine whether electronically stored conditions of any offer available to said consumer and stored on said database have been satisfied* (column 5, lines 24-31);
- *and providing a reward to said consumer at said at least one point of sale system if said redemption engine determines that said electronically stored conditions of any offer have been satisfied* (column 6, lines 42-49 and column 5, lines 24-31).

Claim 2:

As per claim 2, Day teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said compiling step comprises receiving an electronic data file containing information about at least one offer from an entity* (column 3, lines 57-58).

Claim 3:

As per claim 3, Day teaches the method of claim 2 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said receiving step comprises receiving an electronic data file from a product manufacturer* (column 3, lines 58-64).

Claim 4:

As per claim 4, Day teaches the method of claim 2 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said receiving step comprises receiving an electronic data file from a retailer* (column 5, lines 24-28).

Claim 5:

As per claim 5, Day teaches the method claim of 2 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said receiving step comprises receiving an electronic data file from a distributor of offers* (column 3, lines 47-50).

Claim 6:

As per claim 6, Day teaches the method claim of 2, as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said electronic data file receiving step comprises receiving in electronic form information about at least one offer available to a number of targeted individuals* (column 7, lines 18-22).

Claim 7:

As per claim 7, Day teaches the method of claim 6 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said receiving step comprises receiving for each said offer at least one of information about a targeted consumer, information about a product to be discounted, offer conditions, identification of a reward, an identity of a retailer, at least one retail location to which said offer may be transmitted, an expiration date, and a limit on number of uses of the offer* (column 7, lines 18-36).

Claims 8 and 29:

As per claims 8 and 29, Day teaches the method and system of claims 1 and 27 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said identifying step comprises identifying said consumer via a specific consumer identifier* (column 4, lines 25-28 and lines 34-42).

Claims 9 and 30:

As per claims 9 and 30, Day teaches the method and system of claims 8 and 27 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said identifying step comprises identifying said consumer via a frequent shopper number* (column 4, lines 25-28).

Claim 10:

As per claim 10, Day teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said redemption engine providing step comprises providing said redemption engine on a controller associated with said at least one retail point of sale system* (column 5, lines 10-11 and lines 13-15).

Claims 11 and 32:

As per claims 11 and 32, Day teaches the method and system of claims 1 and 27 as described above. Day further teaches *comprising rechecking validation of a redeemed offer at a central system remote from said at least one retail point of sale system* (column 6, lines 22-49).

Claim 13:

As per claim 13, Day teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said rechecking step comprises:*

- *retrieving a log from said at least one point of sale system which contains a record of each redeemed offer and each sale transaction involving each said redeemed offer and identification of each consumer redeeming each said redeemed offer* (column 3, lines 22-25 and column 6, lines 39-49)*;*
- *transmitting said log to a processor at said central system* (column 6, lines 39-49)*;*
- *and verifying that said electronically stored conditions for each said redeemed offer were met and that each said reward was appropriately issued using said processor at said central system* (column 6, lines 39-49).

Claim 28:

As per claim 28, Day teaches the system of claim 27 as described above. Day further teaches *further comprising means for inputting an electronic data file contain information about at least one targeted offer from at least one entity* (column 3, lines 57-58).

Claim 31:

As per claim 31, Day teaches the system of claim 27 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said redemption engine is resident on a controller associated with the at least one point of sale system* (column 5, lines 10-11 column 5, lines 13-15 and lines 24-25).

Claim 33:

As per claim 33, Day teaches the system of claim 32 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said rechecking means comprises means for retrieving a log from the at least one point of sale system which contains a record of each redeemed offer and each sale transaction involving each said redeemed offer and identification information about each consumer redeemed each said redeemed offer* (column 3, lines 22-25 and column 6, lines 39-49), *and means for verifying that electronically stored conditions for each said redeemed offer have been met and that each said reward was appropriately issued* (column 6, lines 39-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 12, 14, 16-26 and 35-37are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day et al. US Patent 5,857,175 in view of Granger WO 95/30199.

Claim 12:

As per claim 12, Day teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Day does not teach *wherein said rechecking step comprises performing said rechecking step at a non-retail store location.* However, Granger teaches a method and apparatus for electronically clearing and processing bar-coded discount coupons in page 1, lines 6-7 and further discloses "*The invention provides for virtually automatic payments to the retailers based on an electronic coupon count and only a single physical coupon count, and using an extremely robust validation procedure in the stores and at the central coupon processing site.*" and "*The method further comprises the step of further validating coupons at the central site, by comparing coupon data with its related sales transaction data and matching family code field included in the coupon data with a*

purchased item identified..." (page 4, lines 27-30 and page 5, lines 9-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to perform a rechecking step at a non-retail store location. One would have been motivated to perform a rechecking step at a non-retail store location to insure fraudulent coupon activities do not occur and having a third party review the validity of the coupons.

Claim 14:

As per claim 14, Day teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Day does not teach *comprising providing a reimbursement value for each redeemed offer to a creator of each said redeemed offer after said rechecking step has shown that each said redeemed offer has been properly redeemed.* However, Granger teaches a method and apparatus for electronically clearing and processing bar-coded discount coupons in page 1, lines 6-7 and further discloses "*The invention provides for virtually automatic payments to the retailers based on an electronic coupon count and only a single physical coupon count, and using an extremely robust validation procedure in the stores and at the central coupon processing site."* and *"More particularly, the invention relates to systems for "clearing" such coupons, i.e., ensuring that each coupon collected by a retailer from a customer results in an agreed payment to the retailer from the manufacturer that produced the coupon, and deriving information from the coupon to include in reports to the manufacturer. Each retailer who collects a coupon from a customer is promised, usually on the face of the coupon, to be reimbursed for the amount of the discount, plus a small handling fee."* (Granger page 1, lines 7-13 and page 4, lines 27-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to provide a reimbursement value for each redeemed offer to a creator of each redeemed offer. One would have been motivated to provide a reimbursement value to the retailer by the manufacturer in order to refund the savings provided to the customer by accepting the coupons.

Claims 16 and 35:

As per claims 16 and 35 Day discloses the system and method comprising:

- *electronically entering information about at least one targeted offer into a central database* (column 3, lines 23-28 column 3, lines 38-41 and lines 46-48);
- *placing the database into communication with a point-of-sale system at another location* (column 3, lines 13-15 column 3, lines 32-34 and lines 46-48);
- *transferring data about each redeemed offer from the point-of-sale system for validation* (column 6, lines 42-46);
- *validating each said redeemed offer* (column 6, lines 42-49);

Day does not teach *electronically determining from the data an amount of money to be received by a seller from at least one offer source.* However, Granger discloses a method and apparatus for electronically clearing and processing bar-coded discount coupons in page 1, lines 6-7 and further discloses *"At central site, the steps of the method include receiving coupon data from multiple retail stores; processing the coupon data to yield timely manufacturer and retailer invoices and reports; and effecting payment of the retailers by manufacturers for redeemed and validated coupons"* (Granger, page 4, lines 24-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to electronically determine from the data the amount of money to be received by seller from at least one offer source. One would have been motivated to electronically determine from the data an amount of money to be received by seller in order to reimburse the seller with money in a quick and efficient manner.

Day does not teach *providing a report of monies to be received to the seller.* However, Granger discloses a method and apparatus for electronically clearing and processing bar-coded discount coupons in page 1, lines 6-7 and further discloses *"At central site, the steps of the method include receiving coupon data from multiple retail stores; processing the coupon data to yield timely manufacturer and retailer invoices and reports..."* (Granger, page 4, lines 24-26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to provide a report of monies to be

received to the seller. One would have been motivated to provide a report of monies to be received to the seller in order to keep an accurate account of the redeemed coupons and to keep track of the money owed to the seller.

Day does not teach *and providing a statement of monies to be paid to the seller to each offer source.* However, Granger discloses a method and apparatus for electronically clearing and processing bar-coded discount coupons in page 1, lines 6-7 and further discloses *"At central site, the steps of the method include receiving coupon data from multiple retail stores; processing the coupon data to yield timely manufacturer and retailer invoices and reports; and effecting payment of the retailers by manufacturers for redeemed and validated coupons"* (Granger, page 4, lines 24-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to provide a statement of monies to be paid to the seller to each offer source. One would have been motivated to provide a statement of monies to be paid to the seller in order to provide a document clearly stating what is owed to the seller.

Claim 17:

As per claim 17, Day in view of Granger teaches the method of claim 16 as described above and further teaches *wherein said entering step further comprises entering into said database at least one of a product and a product category for which each said offer may be used, and entering data defining a value for each said offer into said database* (Granger, page 4, lines 15-19 and lines 21-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to enter into a database a product and a product category for which offer may be used and entering a value for each offer. One would have been motivated to enter a product and a product category into a database for each offer in order to identify each offer corresponding to a particular product or product category and prevent fraudulent activities from occurring.

Claim 18:

As per claim 18, Day in view of Granger teaches the method of claim 16 as described above. Day further teaches *maintaining a local offer database at said another location* (Day column 3, lines 17-20 and lines 23-25)*; and said communication placing step comprising providing information about at least one available targeted offer to said local offer database* (Day column 3, lines 17-20 and lines 25-28).

Claim 19:

As per claim 19, Day in view of Granger teaches the method of claim 18 as described above. Day further teaches *wherein said data transferring step comprises periodically transferring redeemed offer data from said local offer database to said central database* (Day column 3, lines 46-48).

Claim 20:

As per claim 20, Day in view of Granger teaches the method of claim 18 as described above and further teaches:

converting information on paper coupons submitted for redemption to an electronic file (Granger, page 1, lines 20-24 page 4, lines 14-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to convert information on paper coupons to an electronic file. One would have been motivated to convert information on paper coupons for redemption to an electronic file in order to prevent from collecting an enormous amount of paper coupons from consumers and to keep an account or file of redeemed coupons that can be easily maintained via a computerized system;

transferring said electronic file representative of said converted information to said local offer database (Granger, page 4, lines 21-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to transfer electronic files representative of converted information to a local offer database. One would have been motivated to transfer electronic files of

converted information to local offer database in order for the retailer to keep a record of the offers redeemed at that particular retail store;

periodically transmitting said electronic file to said central database (Granger, page 4, lines 21-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to periodically transmit electronic files to a central database. One would have been motivated to transmit electronic files to a central database in order for all retail franchises, retail headquarters and third parties to have access to the data stored in the central database and analyze and report information related to the data stored;

and determining from said transmitted electronic file and said information in said central database whether said converted paper coupons have been properly redeemed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to determine from the electronic files from the central database whether paper coupons have been properly redeemed. One would have been motivated to determine from the electronic files from the database whether paper coupons have been properly redeemed in order to prevent fraudulent activities from consumers, prevent from losing money and be properly reimbursed by manufacturers or creators of the paper coupon incentives (Granger, page 4, lines 6-17).

Claim 21:

As per claim 21, Day in view Granger teaches the method claim of 16 as described above and further teaches *wherein said entering step comprises entering targeted offers from multiple offer sources.* (Granger, page 4, lines 24-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to enter targeted offers from multiple offer sources. One would have been motivated to enter targeted offers from multiple offer sources in order to compile all types of offers to one location for easy access and compare multiple offers available.

Claim 22:

As per claim 22, Day in view of Granger teaches the method of claim 16 as described above and further teaches *wherein said validating step comprises comparing data about each transaction involving*

each said redeemed offer with redemption conditions stored in said central database to insure that said redemption conditions have been met (Granger, page 5, lines 6-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to compare data about each transaction involving redeemed offers with redemption conditions stored in central database to insure redemption conditions have been met. One would have been motivated to compare data about each transaction involving a redeemed offer with redemption conditions stored in central database to insure redemption conditions have been met in order to prevent the retailer from losing money to due to fraudulent activities and keep an accurate account of redeemed offers.

Claims 23 and 37:

As per claims 23 and 37, Day in view of Granger teaches the method and system claims of 16 and 35 as described above and further teaches *comprising auditing at least some transactions relating to redeemed offers* (Granger, page 10, lines 12-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to audit at least some transactions relating to redeemed offers. One would have been motivated to audit at least some transactions relating to redeemed offers to ensure and verify redeemed offers conditions are met and make sure financial accounts relating to the offers are accurate.

Claim 24:

As per claim 24, Day in view of Granger teaches the method claim of 16 as described above and further teaches:

logging and time stamping offers being redeemed (Granger, page 12, lines 22-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to log and time stamp offers being redeemed. One would have been motivated to log and time stamp offers being redeemed to keep an accurate history of when and where the offer was utilized by the consumer and to gather information regarding consumer-shopping habits;

transmitting information about said logged and time stamped offers to said central database (Granger, page 12, lines 18-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention for Day to transmit information about log and time stamp information to a central database. One would have been motivated to transmit information about log and time stamp information to a central database in order to compile data in one central location available to retail franchises, retail headquarters or third parties to gather data regarding consumer-shopping habits.

Claim 25:

As per claim 25, Day in view of Granger teaches the method claim of 16 as described above and further teaches:

logging overrides performed by personnel at each POS terminal in said point of sale system (Granger, page 12, lines 24-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to log overrides performed by personnel at each POS terminal in said point of sale system. One would have been motivated to log overrides performed by personnel at each POS terminal in said point of sale system to maintain a historical account of overrides occurring and relating to which product category;

and transmitting information about said logged overrides to said central database (Granger, page 12, lines 28-30 and page 13, lines 14-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to transmit information about logged overrides to said central database. One would have been motivated to transmit information about logged overrides to central database in order to compile data in one central location available to retail franchises, retail headquarters or third parties and gather information regarding the occurrence of overrides.

Claim 26:

As per claim 26, Day in view of Granger teaches the method of claim 16 as described above and further teaches *further comprising analyzing said transmitted redeemed offer data for questionable rates of invalid coupon redemptions* (Granger, page 5, lines 13-22 and page 6, lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to analyze transmitted redeemed offer data for questionable rates of invalid coupon redemptions. One would have

been motivated to analyze transmitted redeemed offer data for questionable rates of invalid coupons redemptions in order to keep track and percentages of invalid coupon redemptions in order to improve the coupon redemption process and eliminate invalid coupons from being redeemed.

Claim 36:

As per claim 36, Day in view of Granger teaches the system of claim 35 as described above and further teaches:

said point-of-sale system having at least one point of sale terminal (Granger, page 8, lines 19-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to have at least one point of sale terminal. One would have been motivated to have at least one point of sale terminal in order to quickly and efficiently checkout the customer;

each said point-of-sale terminal having a scanner for scanning redeemed paper coupons (Granger page 9, lines 17-28 and page 10, line 12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to have a scanner for scanning redeemed paper coupons. One would have been motivated to have a scanner for scanning redeemed paper coupons at the point of sale terminal in order to efficiently and quickly read the paper coupon to deliver the offer to the customer;

and a local offer database connected to each said terminal for receiving and storing information from each said terminal about said scanned coupons (Granger, page 4, lines 15-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day have a local database to be connected to a terminal to receive and store information from each terminal about said scanned coupon. One would have been motivated to connect a terminal to a local offer database to receive and store information about each terminal with scanned coupon in order for the retailer to keep a record of the redeemed offers at that particular retail store.

12. Claims 15 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day et al US Patent 5,857175 in view of Deaton et al US Patent 6,993,498 B1.

Claims 15 and 34:

As per claims 15 and 34, Day teaches the method and system of claims 1 and 27 as described above. Day does not teach comprising *activating at least one offer stored on said electronic database by having said consumer first click on said at least one offer on a website.* However, Deaton discloses a point of sale server and method in column 1, lines 12-13 and further discloses "*Further, discounts may be electronically stored on UPC server 12 or a web site 124 associated with store 14 for subsequent access by the customer. The electronic discounts may also communicate to store 14 for application when the customer is identified purchasing the product associated with the discount.*" (Deaton, column 12, lines 65-67 and column 13, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Day to activate at least one offer stored on an electronic database by having a consumer click on an offer on a website. One would have been motivated to activate offers on-line by consumers in order to facilitate the discount process and prevent the consumer from having to print coupons and later forget to bring the printed coupons to the store for redemption.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Jones, US Patent 5,832,458 teaches a point of sale computer system used in retail store to record sales transactions and relates to electronically recording and auditing sales transactions.
- Rando et al US Patent 5,128,520 teaches a point of sale bar code card scanner with coupon validation.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew L. Hamilton whose telephone number is (571) 270-1837. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30a.m-5p.m EST alt Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matthew Hamilton
Patent Examiner
September 4, 2007
MLH

James W. Myhre
Primary Patent Examiner